DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 828 UD 026 007

AUTHOR	Jaeger, Christopher
TITLE	Minority and Low Income High Schools: Evidence of Educational Inequality in Metro Los Angeles. Working Paper Number 8.
INSTITUTION	Chicago Univ., Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta, Ga.; Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Ill.
PUB DATE	Oct 87
NOTE	52p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Black Students; Disadvantaged Schools; *Disadvantaged Youth; Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; *Equal Education; High Schools; *High School Students; Hispanic Americans; Lower Class; Low Income; *Minority Group Children; School Segregation; Urban Schools; White Students
IDENTIFIERS	*California (Los Angeles)

ABSTRACT

Millions of low income and minority students go to high schools that are notably inferior in virtually every dimension to schools educating middle class students. During the last few decades there have been sweeping changes in state and national policy on education, moving towards more rigorous standards for high school completion and college entry while aid to education has been cut in Washington, D.C. Los Angeles adopted such a policy, which is founded upon the absurd assumption that equal opportunity is available in the high schools of metropolitan Los Angeles. In Los Angeles there are large disparities in test performance between city and suburban high schools: low income, minority high schools are consistently outperformed by higher income, white high schools. This pattern is especially evident between the years 1980 and 1986, when the minority population in Los Angeles increased sharply. There is a strong relationship between minority enrollment, low income, parental achievement, and school test performance. The greater the difference in minority versus white enrollment in metropolitan high schools, the greater the income and test differences that occur. Minority, low income high school students are victims of inequitable educational opportunities that deny them future success in the working world and that makes future victims of their children. Data are presented on 15 tables. Appendices compare academic performance by school, subject, and year, and display results of regression analysis of the data. (BJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

2/4/88

ED290828

Minority and Low Income High Schools: Evidence of Educational Inequality in Metro Los Angeles

Christopher Jaeger

Working Paper Number 8

METROPOLITAN OPPORTUNITY PROJECT

University of Chicago
Gary Orfield, Director

UD026007

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William Harms
Univ. of Chicago

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Funded by grants from the Southern Education Foundation and the Spencer Foundation

October, 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FOREWORD

Most middle class Americans take high school for granted and believe that opportunity depends on college and post-collegiate education. For millions of low income and minority families, however, getting through high school is still a very severe challenge and the battle to finish often takes place in high schools that are notably inferior in virtually every dimension to schools educating middle class students. It is in these high schools that a shockingly high number of those teenagers drop out, losing their hope for a college education and the possibility for anything but a marginal and low-paid future in the American economy, a society based on economic success. Others, who make it through, find out when they get to college that they are not really prepared and they rapidly fail.

High schools are unequal. We all know that, yet, for policy purposes, we tend to assume that it is fair to act as if all students have been given the same chance. During the last decade there have been sweeping changes in state and national policy on education, moving toward more rigorous standards for high school completion and for college entrance even while aid to education has been cut in Washington, D.C., and in a number of states. The belief that more can be demanded while less assistance is provided is rooted in a radical rejection of the understanding of the 1960s. In the sixties policy was based on a belief that educational opportunities were not equal and that low income and minority children needed special assistance either by provision of new resources targeted on specific educational needs

or by a real effort to open up opportunities for these students to enroll in schools with less stratified and more successful student bodies. Desegregation, compensatory education, bilingual education and the policy of parent involvement all assumed the need for major changes to make opportunity more equal. In the eighties the reforms assume that equal opportunity already exists and that the reason why inner-city schools are failing is that they and their students have not been subjected to increasingly coercive and demanding requirements. In fact, it is considered quite legitimate to raise the requirements while cutting the real resources even where many students had been failing under the lower requirements.

This report explores the proposition that equal opportunity is available in the high schools of metropolitan Los Angeles. This was certainly the implicit proposition when the courts permitted the undoing of the Los Angeles desegregation plan, when substantial cuts were made in school funding, and when both the Los Angeles school district and the state government raised the standards for school completion and college entry without the provision of any substantial targeted resources for the schools with the most at-risk students. This report shows that that assumption is absurd. There are deep differences between schools; they persist over time; they are directly and powerfully linked to race and income. The gaps are widening rather than closing during the 1980s.

This study by Christopher Jaeger of the Project staff is the eighth in a series of reports by the Metropolitan Opportunity

Project at the University of Chicago. The project, funded by grants from the Spencer Foundation and the Southern Education Foundation, is assessing the degree to which the young blacks, whites and Hispanics in the cities and suburbs of the nation's largest metropolitan areas are receiving equal opportunity for education and employment during the 1975-85 period. It examines both underlying trends and changes in educational and economic outcomes that appear to be related to changes in governmental policy. The project is studying high schools, colleges, job training institutions and employment patterns in metropolitan Chicago, Los Angeles, Atlanta, Philadelphia and Houston. This is the first report to be released on the Los Angeles area and there will be a series on other issues in the coming months. The forthcoming high school reports in the Los Angeles area will deal with dropouts and with the curriculum of the various schools. There will also be at least two reports on the college enrollment and graduation trends in the area.

This report is the first anywhere, to the best of our knowledge, to compare high schools over a large metropolitan area over a number of years, showing both the associations between achievement levels and student characteristics and the presence or absence of positive trends in closing the achievement gap. These questions can be analyzed in California because the state government has collected and released more data about schools in a more comparable form than any other state we are studying. The statistics are particularly interesting in California because the period under study includes the implementation of reforms of two

successive and very different state school superintendents, both intent on upgrading the quality of public education. In the middle of this period, in 1981, the California courts permitted the Los Angeles school district to dismantle its mandatory school desegregation plan. The period also includes both the cutbacks generated by Proposition 13 and the increased appropriations that followed the recent state reforms. If any of the major reforms under discussion in California during this period of sweeping changes were powerful enough to alter the underlying pattern of inequality among schools, the results should be apparent in the data on these hundreds of high schools. They are not.

Strong and persistent gaps between minority and white schools, gaps that are actually growing over time, pose a basic threat to a society that is becoming predominantly nonwhite. Data in this report show that between 1967, when racial information was first collected, and 1986 the proportion of white students in the four-county metropolitan area fell from 73% to 42%. The percentage of blacks increased slightly but the percentage of Hispanics soared from 15% to 37% of the region's total enrollment. In Los Angeles County, the 1986 fall enrollment showed only 31% white students. If these trends continue, Hispanics and black "minorities" will account for the great majority of the students within a few years. If school officials in the greater Los Angeles area cannot learn how to run successful high schools for these burgeoning groups and colleges continue to follow rigid exclusion policies based on tests and grades, Southern California is threatened with becoming a society

where the major public institutions for mobility function instead to perpetuate inequality and immobility.

One basic reason for the inequality among schools by race is that the races are carefully sorted out in a highly segregated pattern of education. Between 1970 and 1984, the percent of whites in the typical Hispanic student's school in Los Angeles County dropped from 45% to 17%. In Orange and Riverside Counties there were similar very large increases in the segregation of Hispanics during this period. The typical black student in L.A. County was in a 14% white school in 1970 and an almost unchanged 16% white school in fall 1984. Blacks had always been intensely segregated. Hispanics steadily moved toward increasing isolation within the schools of the metropolitan area (Orfield, Monfort and George, 1984, tables 10, 16). The increasingly rigid separation of students among schools meant that differences among schools came increasingly to mean
racial differences.

This study shows that there is a very strong relationship between the proportion of nonwhite and the proportion of poor students in a school and that both race and income are strongly related to differences in educational achievement. In other words when we say "minority school" we actually are speaking, in all probability, about a low income minority school, and the area's white high schools are actually middle class white high schools. This means that the schools must struggle not only to overcome the effects of racial discrimination on minority children and their families but all the other difficulties that

come from poverty, particularly in communities where poverty is everywhere and few families have personal success and resources or real hope for obtaining them. Too often, these are communities where the family structure is endangered, where crime is a serious menace, where it is the teenage norm to drop out of school, where drug trade flourishes and where the students bring a wide variety of problems with them to school each day. These are, of course, the schools from which teachers attempt to transfer to less stressful environments and where the parents have the least power to obtain responses from the school district bureaucracy or the school staff.

The stratification of high schools and the trend toward growing differences suggest the need to consider issues beyond the existing school reform agenda. If segregated low income schools are not working and there are no signs of improvement, one possibility that deserves the most careful attention is an intensified effort for school desegregation or housing desegregation that would increase the access of minority students to more effective schools, many of which have available space in contrast to the crowded inner-city Hispanic schools. Perhaps a plan like that in metropolitan St. Louis, where about a fourth of the central city minority students will be involved in voluntary transfers to the suburbs, could be operated in some parts of the metropolitan Los Angeles area. Los Angeles area policy makers might also examine the evidence produced in a recent Northwestern University study of the school experiences of two thousand low income minority families who had moved to almost all white areas

in the Chicago suburbs. The study showed remarkably successful adaptation of the young black students, who were transferring from schools that were among the weakest in metropolitan Chicago, in the outlying white schools even without any organized effort to change the receiving schools (Rosenbaum, 1986).

An effective effort to increase housing integration would, of course, increase minority access to white and middle class schools. All secretaries of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development since the Federal Fair Housing Act became law in 1968 have lamented the lack of enforcement powers and there are similar weaknesses in most state and local laws. Amendments to strengthen the law are now pending in Congress. Supporters of educational opportunity should consider the degree to which the structure of unequal education is now rooted in the residential color line and the necessity of directly attacking that barrier.

The strength of the relationships between race, poverty, and achievement suggests that no ordinary increment of funds is likely to produce real change. If a growing majority of southern California students are to remain in systematically unequal schools large new resources should be targeted on minority schools. Staff should be upgraded and curricular offerings equal to those in suburban schools assured. If urban minority youth are to be prepared for college there is also need for larger numbers of competitive magnet programs and much more adequate counseling resources in schools where students rely strongly on advice from school officials.

This research shows that those who want to equalize

school opportunity have to think broadly about policies that would lessen inequality in the society that the schools serve and reflect. Public policies which cut jobs and job training in inner cities, which reduce real income for families dependent on public aid, which push minimum wage families below poverty and which subsidize the movement of jobs from urban minority areas to outlying suburbs, will have impacts that will be immediately felt in the schools. When suburbs with excellent schools take the jobs but enforce land use policies which exclude low and moderate income housing, they are reinforcing the inequality of school opportunities. The schools may not be able to overcome the effects of these larger policies and it may be a great disservice to suggest that we can avoid the large issues and still have a fair opportunity provided by what are unequal public schools. Equalizing education will require much more than new rhetoric about school reform from the state and local educational leaders.

Gary Orfield, Director
METROPOLITAN OPPORTUNITY PROJECT
October 1987

INTRODUCTION

Minority, low income high school students of metropolitan Los Angeles are victims of inequitable educational opportunities which make them ill prepared to successfully function in college or in the working world. In 1986 these students were educated in schools that were sharply outperformed in math, reading, and writing, by the area's white high schools. In the same year only 5 of 71 reporting minority high schools within the metropolitan area exceeded the metro averages of math, reading, and writing. White high schools performed much better. In contrast 138 of 161 white majority reporting high schools in 1986 scored above metro averages. Students who must attend schools that perform unequally are presented with a slashed menu of post-high school choices. They are much more likely to drop out in an educational environment which they find unrewarding, usually before their senior year of high school.[1] The demographic pressures of an exploding minority student population in a state which is becoming increasingly nonwhite magnify the inequitable effects of substandard education offered to minorities and the poor.

In March 1987 school officials of the State of California announced that high school seniors scored their largest one year gain ever on the state achievement tests taken in 1986. The tested classes were the first to reap the benefits of a

---

[1]Zadia Feliciano, "Dropouts, Poverty and the New California School Reforms," Working Paper No.9, Metropolitan Opportunity Project, forthcoming 1987.

multibillion dollar school improvement program begun by the state 4 years ago.[2] This overall state improvement, however, masked problems found in Los Angeles area schools. A month later it was reported that only 30 percent of Los Angeles junior high schools met statewide goals for improvement in eighth-grade math and reading scores. Less than 40 percent of the schools met improvement goals in sixth-grade scores and less than 50 percent met goals for increasing third grade test scores.[3]

The testing record of the approximately 100 high school districts and 450 high schools within metropolitan Los Angeles before 1986 is consistent with the recent problems of these Los Angeles schools. This study of high school test scores of the four county metropolitan area for the school years 1975-76 to 1985-86 shows large and continuing disparities in test performances between city and suburban schools, worsening in the 1980 to 1986 period. The lowest income schools in the area, most within the city of Los Angeles, are in worse condition academically and economically in 1986 than they were in 1976. Statistical analysis confirms our observations of this educational inequity at work--a strong relationship exists between the factors of race, poverty and educational success.

STUDY DATA

This analysis of Los Angeles metropolitan area high schools

---

[2]"School Outlay Stirs California Debate," New York Times, March 24, 1987.

[3]"LA Schools Fail to Improve CAP Scores," Los Angeles Herald Examiner, April 29, 1987.

includes schools in the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernadino, an area of explosive population growth which now contains approximately a twentieth of the entire U.S. population. Our primary analysis focuses on the school years 1975-76, 1979-80, and 1985-86.

A high school data set involving the 438 metropolitan area high schools with California Assessment Program (CAPS) building mean test scores and percent on AFDC for each school was used for analysis. CAPS is the California state testing program designed to measure the success of academic programs in schools and school districts. The program currently tests students in grades 3, 6, 8 and 12. The 12th grade testing data employed in our study included math, reading, and writing test scores.

Racial and ethnic data was more difficult to obtain due to the limitations of California state records. Our analysis employs the two best sources of minority high school data available to our project at the time of this report, the U.S. Department of Education's 1984-85 Elementary and Secondary Schools Civil Rights Survey, and the 1985-86 State of California High School Performance Report Summary. These two sources were merged with pertinent CAPS test and percent on AFDC data and cover over half of the metropolitan high schools in our data set.

A district level high school data set with additional variables was created to further identify the effects of income and minority enrollment on test performance. This expanded data set included measurements of socioeconomic status, parent

education, and limited English proficiency as well as percent on AFDC and test performance.

For the purposes of this study "metropolitan" is defined as the four county area of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernadino. "Suburban" is defined as all metropolitan high schools outside the city of Los Angeles or the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) within the metropolitan area. "Suburban Counties" are the counties of Orange, Riverside, and San Bernadino that surround Los Angeles County. "City" is defined as those high schools within LAUSD. "Minority" is defined as the combined black and Hispanic percent enrollment within a high school. Asians and Pacific Islanders were not counted as minority groups for this study because they are neither segregated nor disadvantaged as a group in California schools.

METROPOLITAN AREA TEST OVERVIEW: POOR LOS ANGELES TEST PERFORMANCE

Our analysis of individual high schools within the metropolitan Los Angeles area tells a story of failure over the period 1976 to 1986. The tables below break out average 12th grade CAPS test performance by subject area and location within the metropolitan Los Angeles area. Los Angeles City and Los Angeles County high schools consistently lag behind outer suburban schools in all areas of testing performance.

Math scores in the overall metropolitan area (see Table I)

decreased slightly from 1976 to 1986 (-0.4). Los Angeles City (-2.6) and Los Angeles County (-1.1) were the worst performing sectors. This pattern was true for both the 1976 to 1980 and the 1980 to 1986 periods.

TABLE I

AVERAGE METRO LA MATH PERFORMANCE BY LOCATION[4]

YEAR	METRO	SUBURB	CITY	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVSIDE COUNTY	SAN BERN COUNTY
1976	64.8	65.5	62.5	64.0	68.7	62.6	64.0
1980	65.0	65.9	61.3	63.7	69.7	62.9	64.8
1986	64.5	66.3	59.9	63.0	71.2	63.3	63.9
CHANGE							
1976-86	-0.4	0.8	-2.6	-1.1	2.5	0.7	-0.1
1976-80	0.2	0.5	-1.3	-0.3	1.0	0.3	0.8
1980-86	-0.5	0.3	-1.4	-0.7	1.5	0.4	-0.9

Reading scores (see Table II) declined in all metro counties over all time periods studied. City high schools displayed the greatest declines. The decline suffered by city high schools (-2.6) from 1980 to 1986 was twice the decline experienced in the 1976 to 1980 period (-1.3). In fact, all metro divisions considered experienced greater declines in the 1980 to 1986 period than the 1976 to 1980 period. Nothing in this data suggests that the California reforms enacted to date have turned around the problems of the region's students in mastering basic skills.

---

[4]Performance scores are averages of building mean scores for respective locations. Scores in this and subsequent tables are rounded to the nearest tenth.

TABLE II

AVERAGE METRO LA READING PERFORMANCE BY LOCATION

YEAR	METRO	SUBURB	LA CITY	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVRSD COUNTY	SAN BERND COUNTY
1976	62.6	63.2	60.2	61.7	65.9	62.0	62.1
1980	62.0	62.7	58.9	60.9	65.4	61.0	61.9
1986	59.6	60.9	56.2	58.3	64.5	58.4	60.8
CHANGE							
1976-86	-3.0	-2.3	-4.0	-3.4	-1.4	-3.6	-1.3
1976-80	-0.6	-0.5	-1.3	-0.7	-0.5	-1.0	-0.3
1980-86	-2.4	-1.9	-2.6	-2.7	-0.9	-2.6	-1.0

Metropolitan writing scores (see Table III) decreased slightly (-0.5) from 1976 to 1986. Los Angeles city (-1.8) and county (-1.2) suffered the greatest declines. Orange County high schools showed the greatest 11 year increase (+1.6), however, most of this increase (+1.4) was attained in the earlier 1976 to 1980 period.

TABLE III

AVERAGE METRO LA WRITING PERFORMANCE BY LOCATION

YEAR	METRO	SUBURB	LA CITY	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVRSD COUNTY	SAN BERND COUNTY
1976	60.8	61.5	58.4	60.2	63.9	59.5	60.0
1980	61.3	62.1	57.8	60.2	65.3	59.7	60.4
1986	60.4	61.8	56.5	58.9	65.5	60.3	61.1
CHANGE							
1986-76	-0.5	0.4	-1.8	-1.2	1.6	0.8	1.1
1980-76	0.4	0.6	-0.6	0.1	1.4	0.2	0.4
1986-80	-0.9	-0.3	-1.3	-1.3	0.2	0.6	0.7

It is obvious that Los Angeles city and county high schools are poorer performers than their suburban counterparts. What may be less obvious is the pattern of decline noted in the brief

discussion of reading scores. A closer analysis of all 3 subject areas shows a general pattern of greater decline or slower improvement since 1980 than over the 1976 to 1980 period. This pattern is most striking in the reading data where all changes are negative, but the pattern holds for all subject areas in almost every metropolitan location. Since it affects many different districts this could be evidence of educationally adverse policy changes by the state or federal government or of social and economic changes affecting the students coming to school in all regions of greater Los Angeles.

To further demonstrate this negative pattern top 10 and bottom 10 metropolitan high schools were identified for each subject area (see Appendix I) in each of the three years studied. A top 10 and bottom 10 average were obtained for each subject in each study period. The results are summarized in the table below.

TABLE IV

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON
BY SUBJECT AREA AND YEAR

	MATH	READING	WRITING
YEAR 1976			
TOP 10 AVERAGE	77.9	71.8	72.0
BOTTOM 10 AVERAGE	45.8	45.9	45.8
DIFFERENCE	32.2	25.8	26.2
YEAR 1980			
TOP 10 AVERAGE	78.0	71.7	72.2
BOTTOM 10 AVERAGE	45.8	46.3	45.7
DIFFERENCE	32.2	25.4	26.5
YEAR 1986			
TOP 10 AVERAGE	82.1	72.4	74.5
BOTTOM 10 AVERAGE	44.7	40.6	43.4
DIFFERENCE	37.4	31.8	31.1

The majority of schools involved in the comparison are from Los Angeles County. As our earlier test analysis would suggest, top 10 schools are predominantly suburban high schools and bottom 10 schools are predominantly Los Angeles city high schools. The range in performance between a typical top 10 and bottom 10 performing high school in math is as high as 32 points in the years 1976 to 1980 and increases to over 37 points in 1986. This extraordinary jump in range from 1980 to 1986 is true in all 3 subject areas and reflects a growth in the disparity of student success between inner city and suburban high schools. This could be additional evidence for the existence of adverse educational policies that have aggravated an already inequitable situation.

The decrease in Los Angeles city test scores shows that those schools have not improved their plight, on average but have fallen even further behind. An examination of schools that have the best and worst records of test improvement from 1976 to 1986 (see Appendix II) proves this point. Reading scores provide a good example (see Table V).

TABLE V

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 HIGH SCHOOLS
READING SCORE IMPROVEMENT FROM 1976 TO 1986

TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
ORANGE	BREA-OLINDA UNIF	BREA-OLINDA	6.2
LA	ROWLAND UNIF	NOGALES	5.6
LA	NORWALK LA MIRADA	LA MIRADA	5.5
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	AVALON	5.4
LA	HART UNIF	HART	5.3
LA	ABC UNIF	CERRITOS	5.1
SAN BERN	CHINO UNIF	CHINO	5.1
SAN BERN	BARSTOW UNIF	BARSTOW	4.6
ORANGE	HUNTINGTON BEACH	EDISON	4.1
SAN BERN	SAN BERNADINO CIT	CAJON	3.9
		AVERAGE CHANGE	5.1

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
LA	LAUSD	BIRMINGHAM SR HI	-7.7
ORANGE	SANTA ANA UNIF	VALLEY HI	-8.5
ORANGE	ANAHEIM UNION	ANAHEIM HI	-9.1
LA	LAUSD	HOLLYWOOD	-9.4
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	MILLIKAN	-9.6
LA	LAUSD	VERDUGO HILLS	-9.6
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	WILSON	-11.3
LA	LAUSD	VAN NUYS	-11.3
LA	LAUSD	GRANT	-11.3
LA	LAUSD	CLEVELAND	-11.9
		AVERAGE CHANGE	-10.0

Schools improving the most are suburban high schools. High schools declining the most are predominantly from inner city Los Angeles, the region within the metropolitan area with the greatest need for improvement. Long Beach, also on the list, is an older district which includes decaying inner city areas.

This section has established that educational inequities exist between city and suburban high schools within metropolitan Los Angeles, and these inequities have grown substantially over the last 6 years. Two obvious differences between the inner

city and suburban high school populations are race or ethnicity and income. We will see that both are strongly related to the success students achieve in their high school years.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES AND THE METRO LOS ANGELES SCHOOL POPULATION

In the 25 years from 1960 to 1985 California gained over 10.5 million new residents. The four counties included in our metropolitan Los Angeles study were responsible for 1.5 million new state residents between 1980 and 1985. The city of Los Angeles averaged an annual growth rate of one percent per year in the early 1980s.

Much of this population growth was fueled by immigration. Los Angeles has replaced New York City as the "melting pot" of the U.S. Between 1970 and 1983 more than 1 million Hispanics, Asians, and other foreign born persons settled in Los Angeles County.[5]

This population influx is reflected in the changes experienced by metropolitan Los Angeles public school enrollment (see Table VI).

---

[5]John Kasarda, "The Regional and Urban Redistribution of People and Jobs in the U.S.," 1986.

TABLE VI

METRO LA PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT 1967-86[6]

SCHOOL YEAR	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSD COUNTY	SAN BERNAD COUNTY	LA SUBURBAN COUNTIES	LA METRO AREA
1967	1400950	304481	96533	148687	549701	1950651
1980	1227063	353705	120781	167799	642285	1869348
1986	1281937	337450	146437	205896	689783	1971720
CHANGE						
1967-86	-119013	32969	49904	57209	140082	21069
1980-86	54874	-16255	25656	38097	47498	102372

Despite the demographic "baby bust" phenomena that dramatically cut school enrollment nationally, the metropolitan area experienced an increase in enrollment of over 21,000 students. Significant growth resumed in the 1980s. The metropolitan area had an increase of over 100,000 students. Over half of these new students were in the schools of Los Angeles County.

More importantly the metropolitan school population was undergoing the same immigrant infusion that the general population was experiencing, dramatically changing the student ethnic mix (see Table VII).

---

[6]Sources for this and the following percentage table are the California Office of Compensatory Education and the California Department of Education.

TABLE VII

METRO LA PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT
BY RACE AND ETHNICITY 1967-1986

YEAR	ENROLL	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERSD COUNTY	SAN BERNADN COUNTY	LA SUBURBAN COUNTIES	LA METRO AREA
1967	BLACK	12.8%	0.7%	5.3%	4.7%	2.6%	9.9%
	HISPANIC	15.6%	8.6%	17.3%	15.3%	11.9%	14.6%
	WHITE	68.8%	89.4%	76.1%	79.3%	84.4%	73.2%
1980	BLACK	16.9%	1.8%	6.6%	6.7%	4.0%	12.5%
	HISPANIC	35.0%	16.1%	25.6%	21.9%	19.4%	29.7%
	WHITE	41.5%	76.2%	65.4%	68.6%	72.2%	52.0%
1986	BLACK	14.8%	1.8%	6.6%	8.1%	4.7%	11.3%
	HISPANIC	44.3%	22.4%	29.0%	24.5%	24.4%	37.4%
	WHITE	31.1%	64.4%	61.0%	63.5%	63.4%	42.4%
CHANGE							
1967-86	BLACK	2.0%	1.1%	1.3%	3.4%	2.1%	1.4%
	HISPANIC	28.7%	13.9%	11.8%	9.2%	12.5%	22.8%
	WHITE	-37.7%	-25.0%	-15.1%	-15.7%	-20.9%	-30.8%
1980-86	BLACK	-2.1%	.0%	.0%	1.3%	0.7%	-1.2%
	HISPANIC	9.3%	6.3%	3.4%	2.6%	5.0%	7.7%
	WHITE	-10.4%	-11.8%	-4.4%	-5.1%	-8.8%	-9.6%

In 1967 white students composed nearly three-quarters of the metropolitan Los Angeles public school population. In 1986 the proportion of white students had dropped to less than half (42.4%). In 1986 Hispanics made up over one-third of the metro school population. The county most affected by decreasing white and increasing Hispanic population was Los Angeles. From 1967 to 1986 the county percentage of Hispanic school students increased 28.7% while the percentage of white students dropped 37.7%. The percentage of black students rose slightly in all counties.

Percentage increases in Hispanic students and percentage

decreases in white students was the norm, too, in the 1980 to 1986 period. All metro counties had decreases in percentage white students led by Orange and Los Angeles counties. Los Angeles (+9.3%) and Orange (+6.3%) had the greatest increases in percentage Hispanic students. The percentage of black students decreased slightly in Los Angeles County and increased slightly in Riverside County.

Some metropolitan Los Angeles school districts, especially in Los Angeles County, have been swamped by the sheer number of children requiring schools. Most of this increase was due to sharp increases in Hispanic enrollment, and it appears further increases will continue.

The Census Bureau states that nationally the Hispanic population is projected to double in 30 years and triple within 60 years. Even without internal migration the Hispanic population may grow more quickly than would other major population groups with immigration.[7] This has been the case since 1980. The Hispanic population is up 30 percent since 1980 which is five times the rate of increase of the rest of the national population. Hispanics are much younger, on average, and have a considerably higher fertility rate than the other major portions of the population. It would seem a safe assumption that California schools, particularly those in the Los Angeles area, will continue to see a greater number and proportion of

---

[7]"Projection of Hispanic Population of the U.S. 1983 to 2080," Bureau of the Census, 1986.

minority students in their classrooms.

LOW INCOME STUDENT CONCENTRATION IN LOS ANGELES CITY SCHOOLS

The measure of low income status in our school data set is the percent of 12th grade students whose families are enrolled in Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC). AFDC is a state-administered assistance program funded by both federal and state governments for poor single-parent families with dependent children. Such families are usually female headed households.

Changes in eligibility requirements have resulted in smaller AFDC enrollment. During the first Reagan administration AFDC caseloads were reduced by a half million families nationally with another 300,000 having their benefit levels reduced as of 1984[8] though poverty rose. The effects of these policies on metropolitan high school students was to diminish the proportion of families receiving AFDC (see Table VIII).

TABLE VIII

12TH GRADE STUDENTS AVERAGE PERCENT ON AFDC

SCHOOL YEAR	METRO	SUBURB	LA CITY	LA COUNTY	ORANGE COUNTY	RIVERS COUNTY	SAN BERN COUNTY
1975-76	11.7	9.7	19.4	14.4	3.4	13.3	10.4
1979-80	10.7	8.5	19.5	13.5	3.1	11.4	8.8
1985-86	9.7	8.7	12.5	10.4	4.5	12.7	11.6
CHANGE							
1976-86	-1.9	-1.0	-6.9	-4.0	1.1	-0.5	1.2
1976-80	-1.0	-1.2	0.1	-0.8	-0.3	-1.9	-1.5
1980-86	-1.0	0.1	-7.0	-3.2	1.3	1.3	2.7

[8]John L. Palmer and Isabel V. Sawhill, The Reagan Record, (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing), p. 192.

Metro Los Angeles high schools had a slight drop (-1.9) in percent of 12th grade students on AFDC from 1976 to 1986. This was primarily due to large drops in Los Angeles City high schools (-6.9) which resulted in a drop in Los Angeles County schools (-4.0). The two suburban counties of Orange and San Bernadino, however, showed slight percent on AFDC increases. One reason for the decline in Los Angeles may be the very large increase in illegal immigrants in the schools whose families wished to avoid any contact with the welfare bureaucracy and were not eligible for benefits.

When the 1980 to 1986 period is compared to the 1976 to 1980 period the more restrictive AFDC policies under the Reagan administration become more apparent. A much greater drop occurs in city high schools (-7.0) and Los Angeles County (-3.2) than occurred in the earlier 5 year period. It is also apparent, however, that despite more restrictive AFDC policies a growing minority suburban school population (see Tables VII and VIII) requires AFDC services. The three suburban counties all register percent on AFDC increases from 1980 to 1986, led by San Bernadino (+2.7).

Though city high schools show the greatest reduction in percent on AFDC, the lowest income schools in the metro area are still primarily within the city of Los Angeles, and economic conditions have not improved. An examination of the schools in the top 10 on proportion of 12th grade students receiving AFDC in 1976 and 1986 (see Table IX) shows all schools involved to be

from Los Angeles County. In 1976 six of the ten schools were in the city of Los Angeles; in 1986 seven of the ten schools were in the city. The minority suburb of Compton, just south of the Los Angeles city ghetto, is one of the poorest suburbs in the U.S. and also appears prominently on these lists.

TABLE IX

TOP 10 SCHOOLS: PERCENT OF 12TH GRADE ENROLLMENT ON AFDC IN METROPOLITAN LA AREA

YEAR 1976

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	96.0
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	92.5
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	88.0
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	64.4
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	56.7
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	56.3
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	50.2
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	42.7
LA	LAUSD	CRENSHAW SR HI	40.6
LA	MONTEBELLO UNIF	BELL GARDENS HI	39.1
		MEAN	62.6

YEAR 1986

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	PERCENT OF ENROLLMENT
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	100.0
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	97.7
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	78.7
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	69.7
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	55.0
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	52.5
LA	LAUSD	DORSEY	46.8
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	44.5
LA	INGLEWOOD UNIF	MORNINGSIDE	43.8
LA	LAUSD	CRENSHAW SR HI	41.2
		MEAN	63.0

The average percent on AFDC of the 1976 and 1986 groups shows a slight increase in 1986 (62.6% to 63.0%), despite a more restrictive AFDC enrollment policy. The lowest income high

schools of Los Angeles County and the City of Los Angeles were in worse condition in 1986 than they were 11 years earlier. These schools are probably worse off than these AFDC measures indicate since an AFDC measure underestimates poverty in areas of high populations of undocumented immigrants such as inner city Los Angeles.

MINORITY AND LOW INCOME EFFECTS ON METRO TEST PERFORMANCE

The relationship discussed between high school test performance, income, and minority enrollment levels, while strong, has been largely circumstantial to this point. To provide a more rigorous test of this relationship, our analysis employed 1985 Civil Rights and 1986 California state high school report data with CAPS testing data. Correlation analysis, a test of the strength of the linear relationship between two variables, and multiple regression analysis, a statistical technique to weigh the relationship of one variable against other variables, were employed in seeking clearer evidence of this relationship. The results show that minority enrollment especially has a strong relationship to test performance.

In 1985 percent minority, defined as the combined black and Hispanic percent enrollment within a high school, was found to have the strongest relationship to metropolitan math, reading, and writing performance (see Appendix III). Greater percentages of minority students within a metropolitan Los Angeles high school were usually associated with lower 1985 CAPS scores in

math, reading and writing. Percentage black and percentage white students also had strong relationships with test outcomes, especially with math performance (see Table X).

TABLE X

1985 MATH PERFORMANCE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.28236	0.04626	-0.95996	-6.104	0.0000
BLACK%	-0.09575	0.02158	-0.27688	-4.438	0.0000
WHITE%	-0.15525	0.04586	-0.50591	-3.385	0.0009
(CONSTANT)	83.68903	4.12375		20.294	0.0000

The fact that percentage of black students had a stronger negative relationship on test performance than percentage Hispanic may reflect the greater racial and economic isolation experienced by black students in metro Los Angeles schools. The strong positive relationship, between percentage white enrollment and test scores, particularly on math performance, confirms our earlier observations that low minority, suburban schools have been outperforming their higher minority, urban counterparts.

The results of our 1986 analysis show percent minority, again, to have the strongest relationship with test performance (see Appendix IV). Percent on AFDC and percent white also were found to have strong relationships with test performance, most notably on math tests (see Table XI).

TABLE XI

1986 MATH PERFORMANCE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.26531	0.02845	-0.99115	-9.327	0.0000
AFDC%	-0.11061	0.02329	-0.20966	-4.749	0.0000
WHITE%	-0.08586	0.02730	-0.32394	-3.145	0.0019
(CONSTANT)	82.13477	2.43548		33.724	0.0000

The juxtaposition of percent AFDC with percent black from our 1985 analysis may be a further indication that low income measures such as AFDC are better reflections of the income of black families, families more likely to be single parent, female headed, than income of Hispanic families.

To further enhance our statistical analysis, a metro Los Angeles high school district data set for the years 1980 and 1985 was analyzed, employing the statistical techniques used in the earlier school level analyses. Though large districts such as the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD) are weighted equally with much smaller suburban districts, the analysis is useful because the district data set makes available a greater number of variables, such as socioeconomic status, parents' education, and limited English proficiency to investigate in our effort to understand test performance differences.

The correlation and regression analysis of 1980 district data show parent education, percent minority, and percent on AFDC, to have the strongest relationships to test performance, particularly for math tests (see Appendix V). The 1985 district

analysis (see Appendix VI) finds percent on AFDC and socioeconomic status to have the closest relationship to testing performance[9]. Parent education, the CAPS socioeconomic status index, and income, all measure parents' achievements which have been shown to influence their childrens' school achievement[10]. Analysis tells us that schools of low income areas will be schools with low testing performance. Taken together, our school analysis stressing the factor of percent minority enrollment and our district analysis stressing parental achievement and income level illustrate a cycle of failure that educational inequity perpetuates. Low testing performance by low income, minority students of city schools helps cause future educational expectations to be lowered or never realized, lowering socioeconomic status and dooming these students' children to similar academic failure.

TEST PERFORMANCE FAILURE BY MINORITY HIGH SCHOOLS

The most striking evidence of the disparity of educational success between low income, minority high schools and higher income, white high schools is obtained when these schools are directly compared against each other in terms of test performance and income level. Employing 1985 and 1986 minority data,

---

[9]Parent education was not measured in 1985.

[10]See Vilma Ortiz, "Reading Activities and Reading Proficiency among Hispanic, Black and White," American Journal of Education, 95 (November 1986), and Zadia Feliciano, "Dropouts, Poverty and the New California School Reforms," pp.18-19.

majority white high schools, those schools with a white enrollment greater than 50% were compared with high schools with a minority enrollment greater than 50% in terms of percent on AFDC and CAPS test scores. The same comparison was also conducted at the 80% level.

The 1985 comparison of minority and white schools (Table X) reveals a difference of approximately 15% in percent on AFDC and a 7 to 8 point difference in testing performance. Comparing schools with at least 80% white students to those with at least 80% minority students, the differences rise to 22.1% in percent on AFDC and a 10 to 12 point difference in testing performance.

TABLE XII

1984-85 MINORITY VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON
BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE[11]

	50% MINORITY/WHITE			*	80% MINORITY/WHITE		
VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	DIFFERENCE	*	CASES	MEAN	DIFFERENCE
				*			
AFDC				*			
Minority	89	18.187	14.7	*	43	24.344	22.1
White	98	3.494		*	28	2.229	
				*			
MATH				*			
Minority	100	57.501	-8.4	*	51	54.418	-12.1
White	101	65.907		*	28	66.475	
				*			
READING				*			
Minority	100	54.529	-7.9	*	51	51.937	-11.2
White	101	62.404		*	28	63.125	
				*			
WRITING				*			
Minority	100	54.305	-7.4	*	51	52.165	-10.2
White	101	61.675		*	28	62.350	

The 1986 comparison is even more striking (see Table XIII).

---

[11]Sources: CAPS and 1984-85 Civil Rights Secondary School Survey.

TABLE XIII

1985-86 MINORITY VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON
BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE[12]

	50% MINORITY/WHITE			*	80% MINORITY/WHITE		
VARIABLE	CASES	MEAN	DIFFERENCE	*	CASES	MEAN	DIFFERENCE
				*			
AFDC				*			
Minority	71	23.872	18.6	*	30	33.250	30.6
White	161	5.263		*	57	2.661	
				*			
MATH				*			
Minority	71	58.407	-12.3	*	30	53.727	-19.6
White	161	70.723		*	57	73.291	
				*			
READING				*			
Minority	71	54.148	-10.5	*	30	50.997	-16.0
White	161	64.693		*	57	67.005	
				*			
WRITING				*			
Minority	71	54.680	-11.0	*	30	51.143	-16.9
White	161	65.701		*	57	68.012	

A typical minority school in 1986 has 19% more percent on AFDC, and trails a typical white high school by 10 to 12 points in test performance. When the comparison level is increased to 80% the differences increase to 31% in AFDC and between 16 and 20 points in test performance. Greater minority versus white enrollment differences result in greater income and test result differences.

Comparisons were also run isolating predominantly black and predominantly Hispanic high schools against white high schools (see Appendix V). A typical black high school registered a poorer performance than a typical minority high school. A typical Hispanic high school performed better than a typical

---

[12]Sources: CAPS and State of California High School Performance Summary, 1985-86.

minority high school. This is a further indication of the acute problems faced by blacks in low income schools within the metropolitan area.

CHARACTERISTICS OF "ABOVE AVERAGE" MINORITY METRO HIGH SCHOOLS

Are any minority high schools succeeding in metropolitan Los Angeles? In an attempt to answer that question, minority high schools[13], that exceeded the metropolitan test performance averages in math, reading and writing in 1985[14] and 1986[15] were identified.

In 1985, 10 of 100 reporting minority high schools passed this average metro criteria (see Table XIV) compared to 61 of 101 reporting majority white[16] high schools.

---

[13]Metropolitan high schools with greater than 50% black-plus-Hispanic-combined enrollment.

[14]Metro test averages for school year 1984-85 are math, 63.4, reading, 59.7, and writing, 59.6.

[15]The metro test score CAPS averages for school year 1985-86 are math, 64.5, reading, 59.6, and writing, 60.4. See tables I, II, and III.

[16]Metropolitan high schools with white enrollment greater than 50%.

TABLE XIV

ABOVE-AVERAGE METRO MINORITY HIGH SCHOOLS IN 1985
WITH MINORITY ENROLLMENT AND AFDC[17]

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	AFDC	BLACK	HISPANIC
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	BALDWIN PARK HI	18.0%	2%	62%
LA	EL MONTE UNION	ROSEMEAD HI	12.0%	0%	55%
LA	LAUSD	FRANKLIN HI	NR[18]	1%	71%
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD HI	NR	1%	96%
LA	LAUSD	HAMILTON HI	NR	53%	20%
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN HI	NR	4%	78%
LA	LAUSD	ROOSEVELT HI	NR	1%	96%
LA	LAUSD	SAN FERNANDO HI	NR	13%	80%
LA	MONTEBELLO UNIF	SCHURR HI	14.0%	1%	61%
ORANGE	SANTA ANA UNIF	SADDLEBACK HI	11.0%	5%	54%
		MEAN	13.8%	8%	67%

Nine schools were in Los Angeles County and 6 schools were in the city of Los Angeles. Unfortunately, only 4 schools reported percent on AFDC. Those with AFDC data did not have high concentrations of low income families, suggesting the probable importance of income level in the achievement of the more successful minority schools. All schools with the exception of Hamilton High School, LA, have predominantly Hispanic enrollments.

In 1986 only 4 of 71 (5.6%) reporting minority schools were identified (see Table XV) as exceeding average metro test scores, compared to 138 of 161 (85.7%) reporting majority white high schools that passed the criteria. White high schools were

---

[17]Sources: CAPS and 1984-85 Civil Rights Secondary School Survey.

[18]AFDC percentage not reported.

sixteen times as likely as minority high schools to exceed average metro scores.

TABLE XV

ABOVE AVERAGE METRO MINORITY HIGH SCHOOLS IN 1986
WITH MINORITY ENROLLMENT AND AFDC[19]

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	AFDC	BLACK	HISPANIC
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	BALDWIN PARK HI	15.5%	1%	66%
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	SIERRA VISTA	14.0%	1%	69%
LA	MONTEBELLO UNIF	SCHURR HI	14.3%	1%	61%
LA	WHITTIER UNION	SANTA FE HI	9.5%	1%	54%
		MEAN	13.3%	1%	62%

All the more successful minority schools were in Los Angeles County, but no schools were in the city of Los Angeles. All schools had predominantly Hispanic enrollments.

The chief characteristic of an above-average minority high school is a large Hispanic enrollment and a small black enrollment. It is difficult to further assess 1985 schools because of missing AFDC data. The schools in 1986 follow the trend of suburban schools outperforming city high schools. The AFDC data is available and indicates none of the schools have a high fraction of low income students. The absence of predominantly black high schools in these lists, save one, shows the likelihood of low income, black students attending city schools offering a competitive level of education with suburban schools is very small within metropolitan Los Angeles.

Magnet high schools were removed from this analysis. Only

---

[19]Sources: CAPS and State of California High School Performance Report Summary, 1985-86.

one predominantly minority magnet high school, LA CES, would have been identified as surpassing average metro test performance in either 1985 or 1986.

SUMMARY

This analysis has shown large disparities in test performance between city and suburban high schools. Low income, minority high schools are consistently outperformed by higher income white high schools. This pattern is especially evident between the years 1980 and 1986. Demographic pressures on the metropolitan Los Angeles school system brought on by sharp increases in minority population have been extreme, especially during the 1980 to 1986 period. Our examination of low income high schools reveals that despite city and metro decreases in percent on AFDC, typical lowest income schools, usually found in the city of Los Angeles, are in worse condition in 1986 than they were in 1976. Statistical analysis shows the strong relationship that exists between minority enrollment, low income and the related factor of parental achievement and school test performance. The greater the difference in minority versus white enrollment in metropolitan high schools the greater the income and test differences that occur. Few minority high schools and scarcely no predominantly black high schools can perform at above average metropolitan standards. The result is that minority, low income high school students are victims of inequitable educational opportunities that deny them future success in the

working world and which makes future victims of their children. The use of 12th grade data probably underestimates the severity of educational inequity that exists in metropolitan Los Angeles. Adversely affected students often drop out of school before their senior year in high school; these students cannot be considered within the scope of this study.

SOURCES

Espinosa, R. and Ochoa, A. "Concentration of California Hispanic Students in Schools with Low Achievement: A Research Note", American Journal of Education, Vol. 95, November 1986, University of Chicago Press.

Feliciano, Zadia, "Dropouts, Poverty and the New California School Reforms," Working Paper No.9, Metropolitan Opportunity Project, forthcoming 1987.

Garrett, Jim. "Metropolitan Chicago Public High Schools: Race, Poverty, and Educational Opportunity," Working Paper No.5, Metropolitan Opportunity Project.

Kasarda, John, "The Regional and Urban Redistribution of People and Jobs in the U.S.", 1986.

"LA Schools Fail to Improve CAP Scores," Los Angeles Herald Examiner, April 29, 1987.

Ortiz, Vilma, "Reading Activities and Reading Proficiency among Hispanic, Black and White," American Journal of Education, Vol. 95, November 1986, University of Chicago Press.

Palmer, John L. and Sawhill, Isabel V. The Reagan Record, (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing).

"Projection of Hispanic Population of the U.S. 1983 to 2080," Bureau of the Census, 1986.

"School Outlay Stirs California Debate", New York Times, March 24, 1987.

APPENDIX I

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 MATH SCORE COMPARISON BY YEAR

YEAR 1975-76
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	CULVER CITY UNIF	CULVER CITY SR HI	82.2
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	81.9
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	78.8
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	77.6
LA	BEVERLY HILLS U	BEVERLY HILLS HI	77.6
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	76.9
LA	LAUSD	TAFT	76.8
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA SR HI	76.1
LA	ARCADIA UNIF	ARCADIA SR HI	75.9
ORANGE	NEWPORT MESA UNIF	CORONA DEL MAR HI	75.4
		MEAN	77.9

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD	51.3
LA	LAUSD	CRENSHAW SR HI	48.5
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	47.8
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	46.9
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT SR HI	46.3
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	45.2
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	44.7
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	43.3
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	43.0
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	40.6
		MEAN	45.8
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	32.2

YEAR 1979-80
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	81.4
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	81.0
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	79.1
LA	BEVERLY HILLS U	BEVERLY HILLS HI	78.9
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	77.4
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	FOOTHILL HI	77.2
LA	ABC UNIF	WHITNEY	76.8
LA	ARCADIA UNIF	ARCADIA SR HI	76.7
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	LAGUNA BEACH HI	76.2
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA SR HI	75.5
		MEAN	78.0

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	INGLEWOOD UNIF	MORNINGSIDE	48.9
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	47.6
LA	LAUSD	CRENSHAW SR HI	47.3
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	46.5
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	46.4
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	45.8
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	45.0
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	44.4
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	43.8
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	42.3
		MEAN	45.8
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	32.2

YEAR 1985-86
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
SAN BERN	MORONGO UNIF	YUCCA VALLEY HI	86.9
LA	ABC UNIF	WHITNEY	86.1
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	83.3
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	82.2
LA	LAUSD	FRANKLIN HI	82.2
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD HI	80.8
ORANGE	FULLERTON JOINT	SUNNY HILLS HI	80.0
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	80.0
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	79.9
ORANGE	PLACENTIA UNIF	VALENCIA HI	79.7
		MEAN	82.1

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
SAN BERN	REDLANDS UNIF	ORANGEWOOD HI	48.3
LA	INGLEWOOD UNIF	HILLCREST HI	47.6
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	47.3
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	46.5
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	46.4
RIVERSD	BANNING UNIF	RAMSEY HI	45.5
LA	LAUSD	JOHNSON	45.5
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	44.6
LA	LAUSD	ELLINGTON HI	39.0
LA	COMPTON UNIF	TUBMAN HI	35.9
		MEAN	44.7
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	37.4

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 READING SCORE COMPARISON BY YEAR

YEAR 1975-76
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	76.0
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	72.0
ORANGE	NEWPORT MESA UNIF	CORONA DEL MAR	71.7
LA	BEVERLY HILLS U	BEVERLY HILLS HI	71.6
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	FOOTHILL HI	71.6
LA	LAUSD	TAFT HI	71.1
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	71.1
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	70.8
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	70.8
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA HI	70.8
		MEAN	71.8

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	LAUSD	CRENSHAW SR HI	49.7
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	48.0
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT SR HI	46.7
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN SR HI	46.5
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	46.3
LA	LAUSD	GEORGE WASHINGTON	46.0
LA	LAUSD	LEROY	45.6
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	45.6
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	44.5
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	40.5
		MEAN	45.9
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	25.9

YEAR 1979-80
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	74.3
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	72.7
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	71.8
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	71.7
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	LAGUNA BEACH HI	71.6
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	71.5
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA HI	71.3
ORANGE	NEWPORT MESA UNIF	CORONA DEL MAR	71.2
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	FOOTHILL HI	70.5
ORANGE	FULLERTON JOINT	SUNNY HILLS HI	70.4
		MEAN	71.7

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	LAUSD	ROOSEVELT	49.1
LA	LAUSD	HUNTINGTON PARK	49.0
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN HI	48.6
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	47.6
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	47.0
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	46.9
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	46.3
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	46.2
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON HI	41.9
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	40.5
		MEAN	46.3
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	25.4

YEAR 1985-86
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	73.9
LA	LAUSD	HAMILTON HI	73.8
LA	ABC UNIF	WHITNEY	72.9
LA	LAUSD	FRANKLIN HI	72.5
ORANGE	LOS ALAMITOS	LOS ALAMITOS HI	72.2
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	72.1
SAN BERN	MORONGO UNIF	YUCCA VALLEY HI	72.1
ORANGE	PLACENTIA UNIF	VALENCIA HI	72.0
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	71.4
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	71.3
		MEAN	72.4

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	BONITA UNIF	CHAPARRAL HI	44.7
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	44.5
LA	LAUSD	RAMONA JR-SR	44.1
RIVERSD	BANNING UNIF	RAMSEY HI	43.8
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	43.0
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	42.7
LA	COMPTON UNIF	TUBMAN HI	42.1
LA	INGLEWOOD UNIF	HILLCREST HI	39.1
LA	LAUSD	JOHNSON	35.7
LA	LAUSD	ELLINGTON HI	26.5
		MEAN	40.6
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	31.8

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 WRITING SCORE COMPARISON BY YEAR

YEAR 1975-76
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	75.4
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	75.1
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	72.5
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	72.4
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	72.3
LA	BEVERLY HILLS U	BEVERLY HILLS HI	71.9
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	FOOTHILL HI	70.3
LA	CULVER CITY UNIF	CULVER CITY SR HI	70.1
LA	LAUSD	TAFT	69.8
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA SR HI	69.7
		MEAN	72.0

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD	48.8
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	48.4
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN SR HI	47.1
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	46.9
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	46.7
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT SR HI	45.9
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	45.8
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	43.1
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	42.4
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	42.4
		MEAN	45.8
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	26.2

YEAR 1979-80
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	74.4
LA	SAN MARINO UNIF	SAN MARINO HI	74.2
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	73.6
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	73.6
ORANGE	NEWPORT MESA UNIF	CORONA DEL MAR	72.3
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	FOOTHILL HI	71.4
LA	BEVERLY HILLS U	BEVERLY HILLS HI	70.8
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	70.7
ORANGE	TUSTIN UNIF	LAGUNA BEACH HI	70.7
LA	S PASADENA UNIF	S PASADENA SR HI	70.4
		MEAN	72.2

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	COMPTON UNIF	COMPTON SR HI	47.4
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	47.3
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	46.9
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD	46.6
LA	LAUSD	WASHINGTON	46.6
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN	46.4
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	45.8
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	45.5
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON HI	43.8
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	40.3
		MEAN	45.7
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	26.5

YEAR 1985-86
TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	PALOS VERDES HI	76.6
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	ROLLING HILLS HI	76.1
LA	ABC UNIF	WHITNEY	75.2
LA	LAUSD	FRANKLIN HI	74.6
ORANGE	PLACENTIA UNIF	VALENCIA HI	74.3
LA	LA CANADA UNIF	LA CANADA HI	73.9
LA	LAUSD	HAMILTON HI	73.7
ORANGE	CAPISTRANO UNIF	CAPISTRANO VALLEY HI	73.7
ORANGE	FULLERTON JOINT	SUNNY HILLS HI	73.7
LA	PALOS VERDES PEN	MIRALESTE HI	73.1
		MEAN	74.5

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE
LA	COMPTON UNIF	CENTENNIAL SR HI	46.9
LA	COMPTON UNIF	DOMINGUEZ SR HI	46.9
RIVERSD	BANNING UNIF	RAMSEY	46.7
LA	LAUSD	LOCKE	45.1
LA	LAUSD	FREMONT	44.9
LA	LAUSD	JORDAN	42.8
LA	LAUSD	JEFFERSON	42.0
LA	LAUSD	JOHNSON	41.1
LA	COMPTON UNIF	TUBMAN HI	40.6
LA	LAUSD	ELLINGTON HI	37.1
		MEAN	43.4
		TOP-BOTTOM MEAN DIFFERENCE	31.1

APPENDIX II

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 HIGH SCHOOLS
MATH SCORE IMPROVEMENT FROM 1976 TO 1986

TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
SAN BERN	MORONGO UNIF	YUCCA VALLEY HI	23.8
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	BALDWIN PARK HI	15.2
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	SIERRA VISTA HI	15.1
ORANGE	PLACENTIA UNIF	VALENCIA HI	14.8
LA	ABC UNIF	ARTESIA HI	14.5
RIVERSD	PERRIS UNION	PERRIS HI	10.9
ORANGE	SADDLEBACK VALLEY	EL TORO HI	10.7
LA	ROWLAND UNIF	NOGALES HI	10.1
LA	LAUSD	LINCOLN	9.1
LA	LAUSD	GARFIELD	8.9
		AVERAGE CHANGE	13.3

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
LA	LAUSD	RESEDA SR HI	-5.8
LA	LAUSD	SYLMAR SR HI	-5.9
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	WILSON SR HI	-6.1
LA	LAUSD	N HOLLYWOOD SR	-6.8
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	MILLIKAN SR	-7.1
LA	LAUSD	GRANT	-7.4
LA	LAUSD	VAN NUYS SR HI	-7.8
LA	LAUSD	HOLLYWOOD SR HI	-8.9
LA	LAUSD	CLEVELAND	-9.1
LA	CULVER CITY UNIF	CULVER CITY SR HI	-12.5
		AVERAGE CHANGE	-7.7

LA METRO TOP 10, BOTTOM 10 HIGH SCHOOLS
WRITING SCORE IMPROVEMENT FROM 1976 TO 1986

TOP 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
ORANGE	PLACENTIA UNIF	VALENCIA HI	11.4
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	AVALON JR-SR	11.2
SAN BERN	MORONGO UNIF	YUCCA VALLEY HI	10.3
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	SIERRA VISTA HI	9.6
LA	BALDWIN PK UNIF	BALDWIN PARK HI	9.3
LA	ROWLAND UNIF	NOGALES HI	8.7
RIVERSD	PERRIS UNION	PERRIS HI	8.5
ORANGE	BREA OLINDA UNIF	BREA-OLINDA HI	8.4
SAN BERN	BEAR VALLEY UNIF	BIG BEAR HI	8.2
SAN BERN	COLTON JOINT UNIF	BLOOMINGTON HI	8.0
		AVERAGE CHANGE	9.4

BOTTOM 10 SCHOOLS

COUNTY	DISTRICT	SCHOOL	SCORE CHANGE
SAN BERN	NEEDLES UNIF	NEEDLES SR HI	-4.8
LA	LAUSD	VERDUGO HILLS SR HI	-5.0
LA	CULVER CITY UNIF	CULVER CITY SR HI	-5.0
LA	LAUSD	GRANT	-6.0
LA	LAUSD	HOLLYWOOD SR HI	-6.5
LA	INGLEWOOD UNIF	INGLEWOOD HI	-6.6
LA	LAUSD	VAN NUYS SR HI	-7.4
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	MILLIKAN SR HI	-7.7
LA	LAUSD	CLEVELAND	-7.8
LA	LONG BEACH UNIF	WILSON SR HI	-9.2
		AVERAGE CHANGE	-6.6

APPENDIX III

Variables used in this test performance analysis were percent on AFDC (AFDC%), percent minority (MINORITY%), percent black (BLACK%), percent Hispanic (HISPANIC%), and percent white (WHITE%). All correlations labeled (**) are one-tailed significant with a p value of -.0005.

1984-85 METRO LA 12TH GRADE
RACE AND AFDC% VS. PERFORMANCE RATE CORRELATIONS

	MATH	READING	WRITING
AFDC%	-0.3520**	-0.4040**	-0.3645**
MINORITY%	-0.6544**	-0.6372**	-0.6195**
BLACK%	-0.5878**	-0.4798**	-0.4849**
HISPANIC%	-0.1897	-0.2813**	-0.2543**
WHITE%	0.5588**	0.5918**	0.5496**

1984-85 METRO LA 12TH GRADE
TEST PERFORMANCE REGRESSIONS BY SUBJECT

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.28236	0.04626	-0.95996	-6.104	0.0000
BLACK%	-0.09575	0.02158	-0.27688	-4.438	0.0000
WHITE%	-0.15525	0.04586	-0.50591	-3.385	0.0009
(CONSTANT)	83.68903	4.12375		20.294	0.0000

READING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.14321	0.01749	-0.55288	-8.187	0.0000
BLACK%	-0.04117	0.02057	-0.13520	-2.002	0.0466
(CONSTANT)	65.91665	0.78014		84.494	0.0000

WRITING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.13891	0.01835	-0.51887	-7.571	0.0000
BLACK%	-0.05084	0.02157	-0.16151	-2.357	0.0194
(CONSTANT)	65.33091	0.81826		79.841	0.0000

APPENDIX IV

Variables used in this test performance analysis were percent on AFDC (AFDC%), percent minority (MINORITY%), percent black (BLACK%), percent Hispanic (HISPANIC%), and percent white (WHITE%). All correlations labeled (**) are one-tailed significant with a p value of -.0005.

1985-86 METRO LA 12TH GRADE
RACE AND AFDC% VS. PERFORMANCE RATE CORRELATIONS

	MATH	READING	WRITING
AFDC%	-0.6603**	-0.6507**	-0.6708**
MINORITY%	-0.8231**	-0.8237**	-0.8033**
BLACK%	-0.6130**	-0.5370**	-0.5115**
HISPANIC%	-0.4999**	-0.5723**	-0.5696**
WHITE%	0.7475**	0.7998**	0.7707**

1985-86 METRO LA 12TH GRADE
TEST PERFORMANCE REGRESSIONS BY SUBJECT

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.26531	0.02845	-0.99115	-9.327	0.0000
AFDC%	-0.11061	0.02329	-0.20966	-4.749	0.0000
WHITE%	-0.08586	0.02730	-0.32394	-3.145	0.0019
(CONSTANT)	82.13477	2.43548		33.724	0.0000

READING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.15516	0.01007	-0.69198	-15.408	0.0000
AFDC%	-0.08796	0.01985	-0.19903	-4.432	0.0000
(CONSTANT)	67.67801	0.34298		197.324	0.0000

WRITING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
MINORITY%	-0.15444	0.01122	-0.63950	-13.766	0.0000
AFDC%	-0.11784	0.02211	-0.24757	-5.329	0.0000
(CONSTANT)	68.90792	0.38212		180.331	0.0000

APPENDIX V

Variables used in this test performance analysis were percent on AFDC (AFDC%), percent minority (MINORITY%), percent black (BLACK%), percent Hispanic (HISPANIC%), percent white (WHITE%) daily attendance (DAILY ATTN), and parent education (PARENT ED). All correlations labeled (**) are one-tailed significant with a p value of -.0005.

1979-80 LA METRO DISTRICT
VARIABLES VS. PERFORMANCE RATE CORRELATIONS

	MATH	READING	WRITING
AFDC%	-0.7106**	-0.6483**	-0.6197**
MINORITY%	-0.8337**	-0.7946**	-0.7682**
BLACK%	-0.4856**	-0.4269**	-0.4028**
HISPANIC%	-0.6705**	-0.6673**	-0.6528**
WHITE%	0.8045**	0.7709**	0.7402**
DAILY ATTN	0.0136	-0.0313	-0.0221
PARENT ED	0.8592**	0.8607**	0.8530**

1979-80 LA METRO DISTRICT
TEST PERFORMANCE REGRESSIONS BY SUBJECT

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
PARENT ED	6.14212	0.63020	0.54418	9.746	0.0000
MINORITY%	-0.09211	0.02077	-0.34250	-4.436	0.0000
AFDC%	-0.12280	0.05594	-0.14556	-2.195	0.0308
(CONSTANT)	50.74518	2.19506		23.118	0.0000

READING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
PARENT ED	5.19043	0.54490	0.59636	9.525	0.0000
MINORITY%	-0.07939	0.01298	-0.38282	-6.115	0.0000
(CONSTANT)	49.25669	1.89829		25.948	0.0000

WRITING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
PARENT ED	5.78586	0.63177	0.61659	9.158	0.0000
MINORITY%	-0.07655	0.01505	-0.34237	-5.085	0.0000
(CONSTANT)	46.75414	2.20092		21.243	0.0000

APPENDIX VI

Variables used in this test performance analysis were percent on AFDC (AFDC%), percent minority (MINORITY%), percent black (BLACK%), percent Hispanic (HISPANIC%), percent white (WHITE%), limited English proficiency (LEP), socioeconomic status (SES), and number tested (N TESTED). All correlations labeled (**) are one-tailed significant with a p value of -.0005.

1984-85 LA METRO DISTRICT
DISTRICT VARIABLES VS. PERFORMANCE RATE CORRELATIONS

	MATH	READING	WRITING
AFDC%	-0.8844**	-0.9044**	-0.8648**
MINORITY%	-0.8846**	-0.8959**	-0.8484**
BLACK%	-0.6733**	-0.6288**	-0.6176**
HISPANIC%	-0.5314**	-0.5804**	-0.5321**
WHITE%	0.8366**	0.8822**	0.8251**
LEP	-0.2304	-0.2630	-0.2186
SES	0.7781**	0.7971**	0.7846**
N TESTED	-0.0460	-0.0833	-0.0859

1984-85 LA METRO DISTRICT
TEST PERFORMANCE REGRESSIONS BY SUBJECT

MATH SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
AFDC%	-0.46561	0.05814	-0.65503	-8.009	0.0000
SES	3.70596	0.85331	0.35520	4.343	0.0001
(CONSTANT)	60.86851	2.97318		20.473	0.0000

READING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
AFDC%	-0.35602	0.03702	-0.66835	-9.617	0.0000
SES	2.85803	0.54337	0.36554	5.260	0.0000
(CONSTANT)	56.99672	1.89324		30.105	0.0000

WRITING SCORE REGRESSION
VARIABLES IN THE EQUATION

VARIABLE	B	SE B	BETA	T	SIG T
AFDC%	-0.38598	0.05484	-0.61430	-7.039	0.0000
SES	3.57816	0.80488	0.38798	4.446	0.0001
(CONSTANT)	55.90091	2.80442		19.933	0.0000

APPENDIX VII

Table sources for the 1984-85 table are CAPS test data and the 1984-85 Civil Rights Secondary SchoolSurvey. Table sources for the 1985-86 table are CAPS test data and the 1985-86 California High School Performance Summary.

1984-85 BLACK VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON
BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE

	50% BLACK/WHITE			*	80% BLACK/WHITE		
VARIAB	CASES	MEAN	DIFF50%	*	CASES	MEAN	DIFF80%
AFDC8485				*			
Black	26	26.173	22.7	*	14	29.943	27.7
White	99	3.468		*	28	2.229	
MATH8485				*			
Black	30	54.418	-12.1	*	15	54.418	-12.1
White	102	66.475		*	28	66.475	
READ8485				*			
Black	30	50.943	-11.4	*	15	46.813	-16.3
White	102	62.368		*	28	63.125	
WRIT8485				*			
Black	30	49.617	-12.0	*	15	45.240	-17.9
White	102	61.634		*	28	63.125	

1985-86 BLACK VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON
BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE

	50% BLACK/WHITE			*	80% BLACK/WHITE		
VARIAB	CASES	MEAN	DIFF50%	*	CASES	MEAN	DIFF80%
AFDC8586				*			
Black	21	36.233	31.0	*	9	41.911	39.2
White	161	5.263		*	57	2.661	
MATH8586				*			
Black	21	52.591	-18.1	*	9	50.400	-22.9
White	161	70.723		*	57	73.291	
READ8586				*			
Black	21	51.095	-13.6	*	9	50.044	-17.0
White	161	64.693		*	57	67.005	
WRIT8586				*			
Black	21	51.524	-14.2	*	9	51.356	-16.7
White	161	65.701		*	57	68.012	

1984-85 HISPANIC VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE

	50% HISPANIC/WHITE			80% HISPANIC/WHITE		
VARIAB	CASES	MEAN	DIFF50%	CASES	MEAN	DIFF80%
AFDC8485						
Hispani	45	16.067	12.6	17	18.882	16.7
White	99	3.467		28	2.229	
MATH8485						
Hispani	51	61.041	-4.8	20	61.065	-5.4
White	102	65.871		28	66.475	
READ8485						
Hispani	51	56.331	-6.0	20	55.035	-8.1
White	102	62.368		28	63.125	
WRIT8485						
Hispani	51	56.216	-5.4	20	55.585	-6.8
White	102	61.634		28	62.350	

1985-86 HISPANIC VS. WHITE HIGH SCHOOL COMPARISON BY LOW INCOME AND TEST PERFORMANCE

	50% HISPANIC/WHITE			80% HISPANIC/WHITE		
VARIAB	CASES	MEAN	DIFF50%	CASES	MEAN	DIFF80%
AFDC8586						
Hispani	33	19.909	14.6	8	20.363	17.7
White	161	5.263		57	2.661	
MATH8586						
Hispani	33	59.915	-10.8	8	59.675	-13.6
White	161	70.723		57	73.291	
READ8586						
Hispani	33	54.361	-10.3	8	53.513	-13.5
White	161	64.693		57	67.005	
WRIT8586						
Hispani	33	54.818	-10.9	8	53.425	-14.6
White	161	65.701		57	68.012	